



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*een*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,855	04/20/2004	Bernard Bendiner	9459-5CT	5321
20792	7590	01/30/2008	EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627			MUI, CHRISTINE T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1797		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/30/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/828,855	BENDINER, BERNARD
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Christine T. Mui	1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 3-4 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claim 1-2 and 5, drawn to product, classified in class 252, subclass 400.1.
  - II. Claims 3-4, drawn to product, classified in class 252, subclass 397.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, such as the portion of sodium nitrate in the concentrated form of the aqueous solution. The subcombination has separate utility such as a preservative in feed stock, antimicrobials in packaged foods and pharmaceutical and other health care products intended for human or animal use.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in

accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

3. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. During a telephone conversation with Michael Sajovec on 23 January 2008 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group 1,

claims 1-2 and 5. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 3-4 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Double Patenting***

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claim 5 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claim 3 of U. S. Patent No. 6,500,360 to Bendiner since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: The method of producing an aqueous solution for

use as a rust preventor consisting of the steps of: a) providing a multiple of 269.5 milliliters of tap or deionized water to a mixing container; b) adding 0.5 milliliters, multiplied by the same multiple, of sodium nitrate to the mixing container; c) adding 270.0 milliliters, multiplied by the same multiple, of potassium sorbate to the mixing container; and d) diluting one part of a concentrate of the contents of the mixing container with 16 parts of tap or deionized water.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

### ***Specification***

7. The application is objected to because of alterations which have not been initialed and/or dated as is required by 37 CFR 1.52(c). A properly executed oath or declaration which complies with 37 CFR 1.67(a) and identifies the application by application number and filing date is required.
8. See pages 3 and 7.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 3,630,226 to Develter (herein referred "Develter").

12. Regarding claim1-2, the reference Develter discloses a biodegradable organic salt that can be used in an air tight container for the storage of food that consists of an organic salt such as the salt of benzoic or sorbic acid (2,4 hexadienoic acid potassium salt or sodium benzoic salt) dissolved in water so that the solution has a total salt concentration of about 0.3 percent by weight and a pH of about 4.2 (see column 4, lines 27-41). It is interpreted by the examiner that the water that is used to make a potassium sorbate solution is water that is either tap or deionized, not recycled or contaminated water. Develter does not disclose a pH of 4.5 or higher. The pH disclosed is slightly lower than the instantly claimed pH. It would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the pH so that is 4.5 or higher so that upon application to a metal surface, the solution aid in the prevention of the formation of rust and corrosion.

13. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,354,902 to Merciadez et al (herein referred "Merciadez").

14. Regarding claims 1-2, the reference Merciadez discloses stabilized aqueous solutions containing sorbic acid or salts, especially potassium sorbate in the amount within the range from about 0.005% to 5% by weight, based upon the total weight of the solution. The solution also includes a buffering system to maintain a pH of about 4 to 5.5 and water (see abstract, column 3, lines 4-14, 40-45). Merciadez does not specifically disclose the concentration of potassium sorbate in the solution to be exactly 0.3%, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to measure out a specific amount of potassium salt to obtain a concentration of 0.3%. Furthermore, the concentration of potassium sorbate is encompassed in the reference.

15. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 4,374,174 to Stricklin (herein referred "Stricklin").

16. Regarding claims 1-2, the reference Stricklin discloses a composition for inhibiting the corrosion of metal where the composition comprises of an essential active ingredient of an alkali metal salt of an unsaturated organic acid, especially potassium salt of an acrylic acid such as sorbic acid. The sorbic acid salts are employed in conjunction with an inert liquid carrier such as water. The proportion of the sorbic acid

salt in the composition is variable and where water is used as the liquid carrier, the compositions comprise from about 10% to about 70% usually about 25% to about 35% by weight (see abstract, column 1, line 57-column 2, line 5, claims 1,4,-6). Stricklin does not disclose the pH of the composition, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust test and adjust the pH so that it is higher than 4.5 to prevent corrosion on metal surfaces.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine T. Mui whose telephone number is (571) 270-3243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-5; Alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Griffin can be reached on (571) 272-1447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:  
10/828,855  
Art Unit: 1797

Page 10

CTM

*Walter D. Griffin*  
WALTER D. GRIFFIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER